

REMARKS

Claims 1-45 are pending in the application. Claims 23-42 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-8, 11-16, 19-22 and 44-45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0196378 (Slobodin). Claims 9-10 and 17-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slobodin in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0089489 (Carpenter). Claim 1 has been amended. Of the claims, Claims 1, 14, 23, 33 and 43-45 are independent. The application as argued herein, is believed to overcome the rejections.

Regarding Claims withdrawn from consideration

In the Reply to Restriction Requirement filed on April 12, 2004, Applicants elected the claims of Group A (Claims 1-22 and 43-45) drawn to Fig. 2 for prosecution. However, the present Office Action Summary page incorrectly indicates that Claim 43 has been withdrawn from consideration. Applicants note that the Examiner acknowledges elected Claim 43 on page 2 of the Office Action at hand. Thus the claims presented and argued herein include Claims 1-22 and 43-45.

Regarding Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-8, 11-16, 19-22 and 44-45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0196378 (Slobodin).

The Applicants' disclosed invention is directed to a system for integrating and coordinating a plurality of media presentation displays. A presentation controller is connected to receive a media sequence from a media source. A presentation server operable for wireless communication with each presentation controller receives the media sequences of each media source. The presentation server includes an arbitrator responsive to each presentation controller and operable to selectively display the media sequences from the media sources sequentially or simultaneously. At least one media transmitter is connected to the presentation server, the media transmitter is responsive to the presentation server and operable to display the media sequence of the media sources.

Cited art, Slobodin discusses wireless transmission of an image from an image generation device to a wireless presentation projector. The transmitter of the image to the wireless presentation projector selects the projector to which it will transmit and sets up a session for exclusive use of the wireless presentation projector.

Slobodin does not teach or suggest at least the Applicants' claimed "presentation server comprising an arbitrator responsive to each presentation controller and operable to selectively display the media sequences from the media sources sequentially or simultaneously". Slobodin does not teach or suggest an arbitrator. In contrast, in the system discussed by Slobodin one host computer has exclusive access to the wireless presentation projector during a session. Thus, in the system discussed by Slobodin, media sequences from the media sources cannot be displayed simultaneously.

The above quoted claim language is in base Claim 1. Claims 3-13 are dependent on Claim 1 and thus include this limitation over the prior art.

Independent Claim 14 recites the above quoted element of Claim 1 in terms of a method and thus similarly patentably distinguishes over the prior art. Claims dependent on Claims 14, thus include the pertinent limitations over the cited art. Claims 43-45 recite the above quoted element of Claim 1 in terms of a computer data signal and an article of manufacture and thus similarly distinguish over the prior art.

In addition, none of the cited art teaches or suggests limitations in the dependent claims. For example, Slobodin does not teach or suggest the "media source is connected to the presentation controller via a video output port operable to transmit the media sequence" as claimed by the applicants in dependent claim 11.

Accordingly the rejection under § 102 is believed to be overcome

Regarding Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 9-10 and 17-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slobodin in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0089489 (Carpenter).

Cited art Carpenter is directed to a system having a single projector and camera. Carpenter discusses a method for remote operation of a computer having a cursor, via a wireless optical device. A camera captures the optical point generated by a wireless optical device (laser

pointer) that emits light at a point on a projected image. Commands are executed by the computer at the position of the optical point. Carpenter does not add to Slobodin the present invention's arbitrator and ability to simultaneously display media sequences as argued above.

Claims 9-10 and 17-18 are dependent claims, claims 9-10 are dependent on claim 1, and claims 17-18 are dependent on claim 14. Accordingly, these claims should be found in allowable condition for the same reasons as claims 1 and 14 above, as well as on the basis of additional limitations in these claims.

Carpenter does not teach or suggest "directing the media source in response to the captured camera signals" as claimed by the Applicants in claim 10 or "control parameters are indicative of which of the media sources to display" as claimed by the Applicants in claim 18. In contrast, Carpenter merely discusses a single media source captured by a single camera.

Therefore, separately or in combination, Slobodin and Carpenter do not teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention. Thus, none of the cited prior art alone or in combination makes obvious the Applicants' claimed method for integrating and coordinating a plurality of media presentation displays.

Accordingly the rejection under § 103 is believed to be overcome.

Accordingly, the present invention as now claimed is not believed to be anticipated or made obvious by the cited art or any of the prior art. In view of the foregoing, removal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and acceptance of Claims 1-22 and 43-45 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Caroline M. Fleming
Caroline M. Fleming
Registration No. 45,566
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 01/16/04